

ROBERT E. LATTA

5TH DISTRICT, OHIO

DEPUTY WHIP

COMMITTEE ON  
ENERGY AND COMMERCE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
COMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY  
REPUBLICAN LEADER

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER  
PROTECTION AND COMMERCE

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, DC 20515-3505**

June 10, 2022

WASHINGTON OFFICE:

2467 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
(202) 225-6405

DISTRICT OFFICES:

1045 NORTH MAIN STREET  
SUITE 6  
BOWLING GREEN, OH 43402  
(419) 354-8700

101 CLINTON STREET  
SUITE 1200  
DEFIANCE, OH 43512  
(419) 782-1996

318 DORNEY PLAZA  
ROOM 302  
FINDLAY, OH 45840  
(419) 422-7791

The Honorable Michael S. Regan  
Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator Regan:

Recently, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced<sup>1</sup> its plan to distribute funds for the “Clean School Bus Program” appropriated through the *Infrastructure Investments and Jobs Act (IIJA)*. While we remain skeptical about the premise of IIJA, we believe EPA has the duty to adhere to the Congressional intent of the bill and fiduciary responsibility to the American taxpayers.

Under the Clean School Bus Program, as reauthorized under the IIJA, EPA is to award grants and rebates to replace existing school buses with clean and “zero-emission” school buses, with 50% of the funds marked for electric buses and the other 50% marked for alternative-fueled buses<sup>2</sup>. According to the legislation, EPA is directed to award funds based on the lowest overall cost of bus replacement and technologies that reduce the most emissions while ensuring parity between technologies<sup>3</sup>. Based off of EPA’s April presentation, it is clear that the Agency has disregarded Congressional intent and made the unilateral decision to promote electric school buses solely.

As you are well aware, and even as the New York Times notes<sup>4</sup>, electric school buses are often two to three times more expensive than traditional or alternative fuel buses, with a traditional school bus costing \$100,000, an alternative fueled bus, such as propane, costing around \$105,000, and an electric school bus costing \$350,000<sup>5</sup>. Based on EPA’s Clean School Bus funding presentation<sup>6</sup>, the Agency is prepared to subsidize 100% of an electric school bus while minimally supporting alternatively fueled school buses. In fact, EPA provides a benefit of 12 to 1 to electric vehicles compared to propane. If EPA followed Congressional intent and provided an

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-04/2022-csb-rebates-webinar-2022-04-27.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Pub.L. 117-058

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/22/business/energy-environment/electric-school-buses.html>

<sup>5</sup>

[https://assets.ctfassets.net/ucu418cgcnau/362sQcGinJzFxVqFh0DBCr/cb2ee507e5c8f646ee133bfdabbccbf/02\\_BIue Bird Electric Bus Presentation Truck and Bus NOTES V2.pdf](https://assets.ctfassets.net/ucu418cgcnau/362sQcGinJzFxVqFh0DBCr/cb2ee507e5c8f646ee133bfdabbccbf/02_BIue Bird Electric Bus Presentation Truck and Bus NOTES V2.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> *Supra* note 1.

even playing field by making the additional \$500 million in grant funds available to alternative-fueled buses, an additional 4,000 school buses could replace current vehicles. Over the program's lifespan, this would amount to 20,000 school buses that could benefit rural, low-income, and underserved communities across the country.

Additionally, it is essential to note the idea of a "zero-emission" vehicle is a fallacy, at best. If you look at the emissions required to produce and charge an electric vehicle, the benefits of alternative-fueled vehicles become even more obvious. Cobalt, lithium, and other minerals are required to produce the lithium-ion batteries used in electric vehicles and "have been linked to grave environmental and human rights concerns<sup>7</sup>." One study found that 87% of children and 53% of the entire population living near rare earth mines had "markedly elevated" levels of metals in their system<sup>8</sup>.

According to information provided by the National Propane Gas Association, well-to-wheels carbon emissions calculations show an electric school bus emits approximately 1.11 kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq/mile. Thus, a total investment of \$830,000 (purchase of vehicle and infrastructure) for a bus that travels 15,000 miles per year would result in an expenditure of \$49.85 per kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq. Conversely, a propane school bus, with total well-to-wheels carbon emissions of approximately 1.70 kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq/mile and an investment of \$165,000 (purchase of vehicle and infrastructure) would yield an expenditure of \$6.47 per kgCO<sub>2</sub>eq for the same annual miles traveled.<sup>9</sup> The U.S. Department of Energy confirms these calculations, saying simply, "EVs may not demonstrate a strong well-to-wheel emissions benefit."<sup>10</sup>

Knowing this information, the only conclusion that we can reach is that EPA is using the authority as defined under the IIJA to pick winners and losers in the transportation market. If EPA was genuinely concerned with reducing emissions, funding for the FY22 Clean School Bus Program would actually "promote parity<sup>11</sup>" amongst available technologies, which would help clean the air and ensure economic viability of communities they serve.

We request the Agency to provide their rationale on funding for 2023, explain how providing a 12 to 1 benefit to a particular technology meets the requirements set forth by IIJA, and to reconsider its funding for this fiscal year and the remaining years funding.

Sincerely,



Robert E. Latta  
Member of Congress



Mike Carey  
Member of Congress

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/02/climate/electric-vehicles-environment.html>

<sup>8</sup> <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19486963/>

<sup>9</sup> Comment from M. Calderera of NPGA to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Stakeholder Input on Clean School Bus Program, (Dec. 21, 2021).

<sup>10</sup> [https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/electric\\_emissions.html](https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/electric_emissions.html)

<sup>11</sup> *Supra* note 1.



Troy Balderson  
Member of Congress



Bill Johnson  
Member of Congress



Debbie Lesko  
Member of Congress



David B. McKinley, P.E.  
Member of Congress



Markwayne Mullin  
Member of Congress



Greg Pence  
Member of Congress



Larry Bucshon, M.D.  
Member of Congress



Earl L. "Buddy" Carter  
Member of Congress



Tim Walberg  
Member of Congress



Jeff Duncan  
Member of Congress



Dan Crenshaw  
Member of Congress